UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/668,721 09/22/2003		Paul Haahr	0026-0151	2439
44989 HARRITY SNY	7590 07/28/200 YDER, LLP	EXAMINER		
11350 Random		PYO, MONICA M		
SUITE 600 FAIRFAX, VA 22030			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2161	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/28/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/668,721	HAAHR ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	IN STATE A THE	2101
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED <u>10 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (periods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidav eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	it, or other evidence, which places the with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailin	-	
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or	later than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THI	g date of the final rejection.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07 Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.4 stension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origor than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropriate extension fee inally set in the final Office action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	pliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be	filed within two months of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below 	nsideration and/or search (see NO	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)		. ,
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).	·	•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>79-117</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		il be entered and an explanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 		
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attached.
The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowance because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
/Apu M Mofiz/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2161		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's arguments, the Examiner maintains the same position as explained in the Final Office Action.

In response to applicant's argument that the teachings of Liddy in view McGreevy fail to disclose the feature of "forumulating a search query refinement suggestion based on at least one of the search result documents and at least one search query-search document association in a database relating to the at least one search result document, where each search query-query document association represents a one-to-one pairing of an issued search query and a search document." However, the Examiner disagrees. The features, upon which applicant relies (i.e., relating to the at least one search result document, where each search query-query document association represents a one-to-one pairing of an issued search query and a search document) <Remarks: pages 2-3>, are not recited in the claims. It should be noted that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. As explained in the prior Office Action, Liddy in view McGreevy teaches the query refinement based on basis of such documents being of paricular relevance (i.e., col. 3, Ins. 1-14 of Liddy & col. 51, Ins. 51-67 of McGreevy). Thus, this arguemnt on which applicant relies is not claimed and therefore is irrelevant.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no specific suggestion or teaching in the references to combine piror art, the combination of familiar elements according to knownmethods islikely to be obvious when it does no more than yield predictable results. Again, the test for obviousnes is not whether the features of secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference; nor is it that the claimed invetion must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art.